

REMARKS

Claims 2-5, 7-8, and 10-14 have been cancelled, Claims 6 and 9 have been rewritten in independent form, and Claims 29 and 30 have been amended in response to Examiner rejections and objections. The Abstract has been amended to reduce its length. Claims 6, 9, and 15-46 remain pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Acknowledgment was made in the Office Action of a claim for domestic priority under 35 USC §§ 120 and/or 121. However, no such priority claim was made. The application does, however, include a claim for domestic priority under 35 USC § 119(e) to provisional App. Nos. 60/183,499 (filed 02/17/2000) and 60/226,147 (filed 08/18/2000). Acknowledgment of the claim for domestic priority is respectfully requested.

Examiner has rejected Claims 2-4 under 35 USC §102 as anticipated by Sadot (US6222964), and rejected Claims 5 and 11-14 under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable in view of Sadot. Accordingly, please cancel Claims 2-5 and 11-14 without prejudice. No admission of non-patentability is intended, nor should such an admission be inferred.

Examiner has rejected Claims 7-8 and 10 under 35 USC §102 as anticipated by Stowe (US5138676). Accordingly, please cancel Claims 7-8 and 10 without prejudice. No admission of non-patentability is intended, nor should such an admission be inferred.

Examiner has rejected Claims 29 and 30 under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable in view of Stowe. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 29 and 30, as amended, patentably distinguish over Stowe.

In particular, Claims 29 and 30 have been amended to specifically recite that the resonant optical component includes “at least one fiber-ring resonator”, and to further recite that the fiber-ring resonator includes “a transverse resonator segment integral with a resonator optical fiber ... to support at least one resonant optical mode near an outer circumferential surface ...”. Stowe does not show, teach, or suggest use of such a fiber-ring resonator. Since claimed elements and limitations are missing from the cited reference, and since there is no motivation or suggestion to include the missing elements and limitations, it is respectfully submitted that a rejection under 35 USC §103 is improper, and should be withdrawn.

Examiner has objected to Claims 6 and 9 as being dependent on rejected base claims. Accordingly, Claims 6 and 9 have been rewritten in independent form so as to include all elements and limitations of the respective base claims and intervening claims (base Claim 2 and intervening Claim 3 for rewritten Claim 6; base Claim 7 and intervening Claim 8 for rewritten Claim 9).

Applicants acknowledge allowance of Claims 15-28 and 31-46.

In view of the above, it is submitted that Claims 6, 9, and 29-30 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections is respectfully requested. Allowance of Claims 6, 9, and 29-30 and issuance of a Notice of Allowance at an early date are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

MSI